

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS AUSTIN

GROVER SELLERS

Honorable Vallace Hughston, Director Motor Transportation Division Railroad Commission of Texas Austin, Texas

Dear Sir:

Opinion No. 0-6437
Ber the necessity for cotice
under Art. 9118, 26c. 11,
to common carriers",
specialized motor carriers",
and contract carriers" upon
an application for a certifirate or permit for any one of
the three services.

Te acknowledge receipt of our opinion request read-

"The opinion of your Department is requested on the proper construction of Section 11 of Article 911-B of the Revised Civil Statutes on the subject of notices, and particularly as follows:

"Article 911-B provides for three different elasses of regulated earriers, towit: eommon sarriers, pecialized motor carriers, and contract cerriers. Common carriers operate over regular routes specialized motor carriers operate over irregular routes and frequently within a defined terriber, and the contract cerriers operate over irregular routes and for particular persons and usually in unlimited areas.

"l. Are common carriers entitled to notice of applications of either or both of the other two elss: as of carriers? Hon. Wellace Hughston, page 2

- "2. Are specialized motor earriers entitled to notice of applications of either or both of the other two classes of carriers?
- *3. Are contract carriers entitled to notice of applications of either or both of the other two classes of carriers?

"Generally speaking, of what applications are each of the three carriers named above entitled to notice?"

Fection 11 of Article 911b, Vernon's Annotated Civil Statutes, reads as follows:

"See. 11. Upon the filing of said application for a certificate or permit, the Commission shall fix a time and place for hearing, and the place of hearing shall be in the City of Austin, Texas, unless otherwise ordered by the Commission. Notice of the filing of said application, and the time and place of hearing, shall be given by mail not less than ten (10) days, exclusive of the day of mailing before such hearing, addressed to the owner or owners of existing transportation facilities serving such tertitory as applicant seeks to serve, as well as to the Highway Commission of the State of Texas, the County Judge or Judges of the counties and to the mayor of any incorporate: eity or town through which such earrier seeks to operate."

In our opinion the language "owner or owners of existing transportation facilities serving such territory as applient seeks to serve" is broad enough to include "common earriers", "specialized motor carriers" and "contract carriers." In determining whether or not to issue a certificate or permit for any one of these services the commission must consider "the existing transportation facilities serving such territory" in order to determine, first, the public necessity for an additional service and, second, whether or not the additional service would be injurious to the highways and dangerous to

the traveling public. The protection of the highways and safety of the traveling public are conditions which enter into the consideration of applications for all chasses of certificates or permits. They are sufficient considerations in and of themselves to justify the Commission in refusing a certificate or permit. Railroad Commission vs. McDonald, 90 S. W. (24) 581; MeDonald vs. Thompson, 95 F. (24) 937, affirmed 305 U. S. 263, 83 L. Ed. 164. All additional transportation services which add as extre burden on the highways or increase the hezerds to the traveling public will effect "the existing transportation facilities serving such territory". We think that for this reason all classes of carriers "serving such territory as applicant seeks to serve", should be given notice of am application for a certificate or permit to cerry on an additional transportation service of any kind.

Trusting that the foregoing enswers your inquiry, we are.

Yours very truly,

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

Fagan Dickson

PDITE

TRST POTENTIAL PER STATE RAI

